Exhibit 21

1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS		
2	MARSHALL DIVISION		
3	NETLIST, INC., (CAUSE NO. 2:21-CV-463-JRG)		
4	Plaintiff, (
5	vs. (
6	SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., (et al.,) MARSHALL, TEXAS		
7	(MARCH 28, 2023		
8	Defendants.) 9:00 A.M.		
9			
10	VOLUME 1		
11			
12	PRETRIAL CONFERENCE		
13	BEFORE THE HONORABLE RODNEY GILSTRAP UNITED STATES CHIEF DISTRICT JUDGE		
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22	SHAWN MCROBERTS, RMR, CRR		
23	100 E. HOUSTON STREET MARSHALL, TEXAS 75670		
24	(903) 923-8546 shawn_mcroberts@txed.uscourts.gov		
25			

1	<u>APPEARANCES</u>
2	FOR THE PLAINTIFF: IRELL & MANELLA, LLP - LOS ANGELES
3	1800 AVENUE OF THE STARS SUITE 900
4	LOS ANGELES, CA 90067-4276 (310) 203-7096
5	BY: MR. JASON SHEASBY MS. YANAN ZHAO
6	McKOOL SMITH, P.C MARSHALL
7	104 E. HOUSTON ST., SUITE 300 MARSHALL, TEXAS 75670
8	(903) 923-9000 BY: MR. SAMUEL BAXTER
9	MS. JENNIFER TRUELOVE
10	FOR THE DEFENDANTS: FISH & RICHARDSON PC - WASHINGTON DC
11	1000 MAINE AVE., SW SUITE 1000
12	WASHINGTON, DC 20024 (202) 783-5070
13	BY: MR. RUFFIN CORDELL MS. LAUREN DEGNAN
14	MR. BRIAN LIVEDALEN MR. MATTHEW MOSTELLER
15	MR. MICHAEL MCKEON
16	FISH & RICHARDSON, PC - SAN DIEGO
17	12860 EL CAMINO REAL SUITE 400
18	SAN DIEGO, CA 92130 (858) 678-5070
19	BY: DR. FRANCIS ALBERT
20	FISH & RICHARDSON, PC - DALLAS
21	1717 MAIN STREET, SUITE 5000 DALLAS, TEXAS 75201
22	(214) 747-5070 BY: MR. MATTHEW COLVIN
23	MR. THOMAS REGER
24	
25	

1		FISH & RICHARDSON, PC - NEW YORK
2		7 TIMES SQUARE, 20TH FLOOR
3		NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10036 (404) 724-2764 BY: MS. KATHERINE REARDON
4		GILLAM & SMITH, LLP
5		303 SOUTH WASHINGTON AVENUE MARSHALL, TEXAS 75670
6		(903) 934-8450 BY: MS. MELISSA SMITH
7		
8		GILLAM & SMITH, LLP 102 N. COLLEGE, SUITE 800 TYLER, TEXAS 75702
9		(903) 934-8450 BY: MR. TRAVIS UNDERWOOD
10		MR. TOM GORHAM
11	OFFICIAL REPORTER:	SHAWN M. MCROBERTS, RMR, CRR 100 E. HOUSTON STREET
12		MARSHALL, TEXAS 75670 (903) 923-8546
13		(500) 510 0010
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

THE COURT: Be seated, please. 1 This is the time set for pretrial matters before the 2 Court in the case of Netlist, Inc., versus Samsung Electronics 3 Company, Ltd., et al. This is Civil Case No. 2:21-CV-463. 4 The Court will ask for announcements at this time. What 5 6 says the Plaintiff? MS. TRUELOVE: Good morning, Your Honor. Jennifer 7 Truelove here for Plaintiff. With me today at counsel table, 8 we have Mr. Jason Sheasby, Ms. Yanan Zhao, and Mr. Michael 9 Rosen. 10 11 We are ready to proceed. THE COURT: Thank you. 12 What's the announcement for the Samsung Defendants? 13 MS. SMITH: Good morning, Your Honor. Melissa Smith 14 on behalf of Samsung. 15 16 I have many people in the courtroom that have joined me 17 today, but what I'd like to do is introduce Your Honor to those that will be arguing today on behalf of Samsung in the 18 order of argument: Mr. Ruffin Cordell, Mr. Mike McKeon, Ms. 19 Lauren Degnan, Dr. Frank Albert, Mr. Brian Livedalen, Mr. Matt 2.0 2.1 Colvin, Mr. Matthew Mosteller, Mr. Tom Reger, and in the back 2.2 Ms. Katherine Reardon. Your Honor, we also have a client representative in the 23 courtroom today, Mr. Michael Nguyen, and we're ready to 24 proceed, Your Honor. 25

2.0

2.1

2.2

that SK hynix does. And even in its briefing, it says that's something that SK hynix HBM1 products do. They made no showing, even slide 37 from -- that they just showed you from Mr. Brogioli, there's nothing in his expert report -- oh, excuse me, sir, Your Honor.

There's nothing in his -- in this slide or in his expert report that ties this multi-drop thing to the specific models that we identified in our *Arctic Cat* letter. It doesn't say that. Again, the -- the briefing talks about HBM1, SK hynix is not practicing the patents. We identified HBM2E, HBM3. There's no indication of what limitations are not being practiced by those products as is their burden to prove.

So I just wanted to make that point that this idea -again, they're trying to shift the burden to us to prove that
the products practice. That's not our burden. We've
identified, given them a list. They've got to tell us why -what limitations are missing. None of that has been talked
about today in the briefing or in the expert reports.

And with that, that's really the one point I wanted to make for Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. With regard to Documents 198 and 199, particularly with regard to Samsung's motion for summary judgment of no damages prior to the filing of the complaints, Document 198, the Court's persuaded that Samsung met its burden under Arctic Cat, which is relatively low, and

2.0

2.1

2.2

shifted the burden to Netlist, and that burden having been shifted, I'm persuaded that the result of the motion is as follows:

With regard to the '506 Patent, I'm going to grant

Samsung's motion. I don't find any notice, actual or

constructive, prior to filing the original complaint on

December the 12th, 2021. Hence, I'm going to find as a matter

of summary judgment there are no damages prior to that date.

On the '339, it's the same ruling by the Court--no damages prior to December the 12th, 2021. And it's the same on the '918.

On the '054, Samsung asks for a finding via summary judgment of no damages prior to filing the first amended complaint on May the 3rd, 2022, but I am persuaded there's an issue as to potential pre-suit damages prior to the filing of the first amended complaint but not subsequent to the original complaint.

So I'm going to grant summary judgment that there's no pre-suit damages or there's no damages prior to the filing of the original complaint on December the 12th, 2021, as to the '054 Patent.

On the '060, there's no notice prior to filing the first amended complaint on May the 3rd, 2022. So it's the Court's ruling via summary judgment there are no damages prior to May the 3rd, 2022, on the '060.

```
previously set on the 17th. Go back 10 days and you get to
 1
     the 7th. We're now on the 14th. Go back 10 days, and you get
 2
     to the 4th. So the first step in that process should be on
 3
     the 4th and not the 7th. The second one should follow, what
 4
     is it, three days later?
 5
 6
               MR. CORDELL: Yes, sir.
               THE COURT: That would put it on the 7th.
                                                           So 4th
 7
     and the 7th instead of 7th and the 10th.
 8
          All right?
 9
               MR. CORDELL:
                              Thank you.
10
               MR. SHEASBY:
                             Thank you, Your Honor.
11
12
               THE COURT: All right, Counsel. We stand in recess
     until tomorrow morning.
13
               MR. SHEASBY:
                              Thank you, Your Honor.
14
                (The proceedings were concluded at 5:15 p.m.)
15
16
17
18
19
2.0
2.1
2.2
23
24
25
```